

Interview Summary

Application No.

10/661,590

Applicant(s)

NAGATANI ET AL.

Examiner

Jeffrey S. Smith

Art Unit

2624

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Jeffrey S. Smith.(3) Kirk Berkheimer (59874).(2) Jingge Wu.(4) Ashish Karkhanis (no reg no).

Date of Interview: 29 November 2007.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference

c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: Hull, Chen.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

JINGGE WU
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant's rep. asked whether amending the claims to include certain features would overcome prior art. However a clear answer cannot be given in the abstract, but can be given by performing a search for features of an amended claim. Applicant's rep. also asked about the benefit of disclosing the corresponding foreign prosecution history, including any foreign rejections and subsequent amendments. The benefit is that there is nothing more relevant to patentability than a patentability report written by a patent office, the response by applicant, and the subsequent action taken by the patent office. If such prosecution history has taken place, it needs to be disclosed to the American examiners.